

REMARKS

Claims 2, 7-14, and 16 are pending in this application. Claims 2 and 7-10 stand rejected and claims 7 and 11-14 are objected to. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowance of claim 16, and the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 11-14. By this Amendment, claims 2 and 7-11 have been amended and claim 6 has been canceled. The amendments made to claims 2 and 7-11 do not alter the scope of these claims, nor have these amendments been made to define over the prior art. Rather, the amendments to the claims have been made for cosmetic reasons to improve the form thereof. In light of the amendments and remarks set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of claim 16 and the indication of allowable material in claims 7 and 11-14.

Claims 7 and 11 have been rewritten in independent form. However, Applicants reassert that Mankovitz fails to teach a first and second broadcast stream as explicitly recited in Applicants' claims. The Examiner asserts that Mankovitz discloses multiple broadcast streams due to multiple 6 Mhz channels in an MPEG stream. However, this is still only a single stream, not a first and second stream as explicitly recited in Applicants' claim.

In an effort to expedite the prosecution of this application, Applicants are canceling claim 6 without prejudice and have rewritten claims 7 and 11 in independent form so that the new independent claim explicitly recites the broadcast

time of said broadcast stream simultaneously including a past zone, a future zone and a current zone inserted between said past zone and said future zone.

Claims 2 and 6-10 which were rejected depend from, and contain all the limitations of claim 7. These dependent claims also recite additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 7, are neither disclosed nor suggested by Mankovitz and are also believed to be directed towards the patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 2 and 6-10 should also be allowed.

Applicants have responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: November 19, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By
Jan B. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas - 41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorney for Applicant

IRB/mgs